

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 03781 161649Z

42

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 ACDE-00 SSO-00 ISO-00 USIE-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00

EUR-12 H-02 INR-07 IO-10 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01

PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01 SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00

NSC-05 NSCE-00 INRE-00 ERDE-00 EB-07 /089 W

----- 077996

O R 161551Z JUL 75 ZFF-4

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2738

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T USNATO 3781

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO, MBFR

SUBJECT: MBFR: OPTION III: SERVICE SUB-CEILINGS WITHIN A COMBINED
AIR/ GROUND COMMON CEILING

REFS: A. USNATO 3695, DTG 111007Z JUL 75

B. USNATO 6794, DTG 051730Z DEC 74

C. STATE 263866

D. MBFR VIENNA 324

E. USNATO 3764, DTG 151800Z JUL 75

F. USNATO 3493, DTG 281250Z JUN 75

1. THE JULY 15 SESSION OF THE WG OPENED DISCUSSION OF THE MBFR
STAFF GROUP AND UK DRAFTS ON "SUB- CEILINGS WITHIN A COMBINED
AIR/GROUND COMMON CEILING" (REF A). THE BELGIAN REP (WILLOT)
CRITICIZED THE STAFF GROUP DRAFT FOR NOT CLEARLY STATING THE
CENTRAL PROBLEM INVOLVED IN ESTABLISHING SUB-CEILINGS. HE
DEFINED THIS PROBLEM AS DIVISING A SYSTEM WITH SUFFICIENT
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 03781 161649Z

SAFEGUARDS TO PREVENT THE EAST FROM CIRCUMVENTING THE NECESSARY
FOCUS ON REDUCING GROUND FORCES, WHILE AT THE SAME TIME
REATAINING SUFFICIENT FLEXIBILITY FOR NATO TO RESTURCTURE ITS
FORCES TO MEET FUTURE DEFENSE REQUIREMENTS. HE QUESTIONED

WHETHER THERE IS A GOOD SOLUTION TO THE PROBLEM. HE NOTED FOR EXAMPLE, THAT THE STAFF GROUP SUGGESTION TO CAVEAT APPROACHES 1 AND 4 WITH SOME TYPE OF NON- CIRCUMVENTION CLAUSE IN EFFECT TRANSFORMS THEM INTO APPROACHES 2 AND 3, LOSING THE ADVANTAGE OF FLEXIBILITY.

2. THE BELGIAN REP REGARDED THE WG APPROACH TO SUB- CEILINGS AS AN ATTEMPT TO ESTABLISH THE PRIORITY BETWEEN SAFEGUARDS OR FLEXIBILITY. HE VIEWED THIS AS MORE OF A POLITICAL/ TACTICAL QUESTION AND WONDERED IF THE WG IS THE APPROPRIATE FORUM IN WHICH TO DISCUSS THE ISSUE. HE ASKED WHERE THE MANDATE FOR THE WG WAS CONTAINED.

3. THE CHAIRMAN (GROUP CAPTAIN SMITH) SAID THE MANDATE WAS SELF-GIVEN SINCE THE PREVIOUS WG STUDY (REF B) WAS INCOMPLETE AND IMPLIED FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF THE ISSUE. THE FRG REP (HOYNCK) SUGGESTED THAT THE WG DID NOT NEED A SPECIFIC MANDATE SINCE SUB-CEILINGS ARE INTER-DEPENDENT WITH OTHER CURRENT ISSUES. FOR EXAMPLE, IF IT WERE TO BE ESTABLISHED THAT LIMITATIONS ON EQUIPMENT ARE ONLY POSSIBLE THROUGH LIMITATIONS ON PERSONNEL, THEN SUB-CEILINGS ON GROUND FORCE MANPOWER MAY BE UNAVOIDABLE TO ACHIEVE A LIMITATION ON SOVIET TNAKS.

4. THE FRG REP SAID HIS AUTHORITIES FAVOR THE GENERAL APPROACH OF THE STAFF GROUP DRAFT, BUT BELIEVE THERE MUST BE AN ELABORATION OF THE TYPE OF "NON- CIRCUMVENTION CLAUSE" CALLED FOR IN PARA 2.B (REF A) IN ORDER TO BUILD SAFEGUARDS INTO APPROACHES 1 AND 4. (THE BELGIAN REP RECOMMENDED THAT A PHRASE OTHER THAN "NON- CIRCUMVENTION CLAUSE" BE SOUGHT IN ORDER TO AVOID FUTURE DEFINITIONAL PROBLEMS.) THE FRG REP SAID HE COULD NOT AGREE WITH THE UK DRAFT TO FOCUS EXCLUSIVELY ON APPROACHES 1 AND 4, ALTHOUGH HE DID AGREE THAT THE US PROPOSALS (REF C) NEED TO BE LOOKED AT MORE CLOSELY.

5. THE NETHERLANDS REP (VAN HEENSTRA) REPORTED THAT HIS AUTHORITIES ARE HAPPY WITH THE UK PAPER. THE CANADIAN REP
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 03781 161649Z

(BECKETT) DID NOT VIEW THE WG STUDY AS AN EITHER/OR PROPOSITION; HE HOPED THE WG WOULD REVIEW ALL FOUR APPROACHES.

6. THE UK REP (GERAHTY-MOD) SAID THIS WAS THE INTENTION OF THE UK DRAFT ; ALL FOUR APPROACHES SUGGESTED IN THE EARLIER PAPER (REF B) MUST BE RE-EXAMINED IN THE LIGHT OF THE US PROPOSALS. THE UK DRAFT WAS NOT INTENDED AS A MANDATE TO STUDY SOLELY APPROACHES 1 AND 4. HOWEVER, HE DOUBTED THE CLAIM IN PARA 2.A OF THE STAFF GROUP DRAFT (REF A) THAT APPROACHES 2 AND 3 ARE THE BEST FROM A NATO MILITARY POINT OF VIEW. HE THOUGHT THE BEST SOLUTION MIGHT ARISE OUT OF THE US PROPOSALS, PERHAPS SOME TYPE OF " NON-EXPLICIT SUB-CEILINGS."

7. THE BELGIAN REP NOTED THAT THE UK DRAFT QUOTED FROM THE US PAPER ON OPTION III CONCERNING THE NEED TO RETAIN AS MUCH FLEXIBILITY AS POSSIBLE. THE US PAPER, HOWEVER, HAD BEEN REFERRING TO EQUIPMENT LIMITATIONS AND HE THOUGHT IT DIFFICULT TO EXTRAPOLATE FROM THIS TO MANPOWER LIMITATIONS.

8. THE CANADIAN REP SUGGESTED THAT IF APPROACH 1 IS ADOPTED, WITH NO SPECIFIC SUB-CEILINGS, THE PROBLEM OF DEFINING FORCES CURRENTLY UNDERWAY IN VIENNA (REF D) DISAPPEARS. THE BELGIAN REP DISAGREED, SAYING THAT ANY COMMON CEILING ON GROUND FORCES WITH A NO-INCREASE CLAUSE ON AIR FORCES IS AN IMPLIED SUB-CEILING AND AUTOMATICALLY GIVES RISE TO THE PROBLEM OF DEFINITIONS.

9. THE UK REP SUGGESTED THAT ONE POSSIBLE COURSE MIGHT BE TO DEFINE THE ELEMENTS TO BE WITHDRAWN, RATHER THAN TO SET EXPLICIT SUB-CEILING. THE BELGIAN REP SUGGESTED THIS COURSE WOULD NOT BE COMPATIBLE WITH THE CONCEPT OF A COMMON CEILING.

10. IT WAS AGREED THAT THE MBFR STAFF GROUP WOULD ATTEMPT ANOTHER DRAFT (TO BE SENT WHEN RECEIVED) IN WHICH IT WOULD STATE THE SAFEGUARDS V. FLEXIBILITY DILEMMA MORE CLEARLY. THE WG WOULD RETURN TO THE TOPIC IN ITS NEXT SESSION ON JULY 29.

11. COMMENT: THE UK AND FRG REPS AGREED ON THE URGENT NEED FOR THE WG TO PUSH ON WITH THIS STUDY ON SUB-CEILING. NOBODY HAS REFERRED EXPLICITLY TO THE RELATION OF THE SUB-CEILINGS ISSUE TO OPTION III IN THE WG (WHICH HAS NO MANDATE TO BECOME INVOLVED IN SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 03781 161649Z

OPTION), HOWEVER THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE TWO ISSUES IS IMPLIED IN THE FRG AND UK ARGUMENTS. THE DESIRED GOALS OF THE UK AND THE FRG, AS INDICATED IN THIS PRELIMINARY DISCUSSION, DO NOT APPEAR TO BE COMPATIBLE. THE UK WANTS A FORMULA WHICH STRESSES FLEXIBILITY AND HOPES TO EXTRACT SUCH A FORMULA FROM US PROPOSALS OF LAST DECEMBER (REF B). THE FRG, HOWEVER, APPEARS TO BE SEEKING A FORMULA WITH MAXIMUM NON-CIRCUMVENTION SAFEGUARDS. WHILE THE FRG REP DID NOT REFER TO THE FRG PAPER ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MANPOWER AND MAIN BATTLE TANKS (REF E), THIS FRG CONCEPT IS CLEARLY CONTAINED IN HIS ARGUMENT IN PARA 3 ABOVE. END COMMENT.

12. ACTION REQUESTED: SEEREF A, PARAS 9-10, AND REF F FINAL SUB-PARA (O). REQUEST GUIDANCE PRIOR TO JULY 29 WG SESSION. BRUCE

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 18 AUG 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 16 JUL 1975
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: izenbei0
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975NATO003781
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t197507102/abbrzlbb.tel
Line Count: 158
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 3
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: A. USNATO 3695, DTG 111007Z JUL 75 B. USNATO 6794, DTG 051730Z DEC 74 C. STATE 263866 D. MBFR VIENNA 324 E.
USNATO 3764, DTG 151800Z JUL 75 F. USNATO 3493, DTG 281250Z JUN 75
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: izenbei0
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 02 APR 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <02 APR 2003 by Izenbei0>; APPROVED <24 SEP 2003 by izenbei0>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
06 JUL 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: n/a
TAGS: PARM, NATO, MBFR
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO MBFR VIENNA
BONN
LONDON
USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

Type: TE

Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006